



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

riage with a woman of the rarest excellence of character seems to have put a period to whatever of objectionable license may have tinged the first years of manhood ; and her early death constituted a marked epoch in his moral growth. From that time we trace the constant outraying of his benevolent sympathies, and recognize an expansive love of his race and a sincere interest in every thing appertaining to the welfare of humanity as pervading elements in every form of his activity. Generous, self-forgetting devotion to the happiness and improvement of friends and strangers, the few and the many, the near and the distant, was the prominent trait of his moral nature, and moulded his whole character into the most lovely and attractive forms and expressions. Few men have had so many intimate friends ; few have loved their friends with so genial and unselfish an attachment. Nor was sincere religious faith wanting to add its crowning grace to a life so rich and beautiful in all its manward aspects. In his early sorrows, we find him seeking relief by trust in a fatherly Providence ; recognitions of the worth and power of Christianity grew more and more frequent with the growing experience of life ; and his Saviour's name, coupled with expressions of faith and love, was almost the last word that fell from his lips in dying.

ART. II. — 1. *The History of Rome, from the First Punic War to the Death of Constantine.* By B. G. NIEBUHR. *In a Series of Lectures, including an Introductory Course on the Sources and Study of Roman History.* Edited by LEONHARD SCHMITZ, Ph. D. London. 1844. 2 vols. 8vo.

2. *A History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Death of Commodus,* A. D. 192. By DR. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F. R. S. E., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh. New York : Harper & Brothers. Published also at Andover, by Allen, Morrill, & Wardwell. 1847. 12mo.

A SINGULAR fatality seems to attend the history of Rome. While that of Greece has been written again and again, and

by able hands, the student looks in vain for any corresponding work on the most important period of the Roman annals. The posthumous volume of Niebuhr's immortal work leaves us at the First Punic War ; and the third volume of Dr. Arnold's history, also published after its author's death, breaks off just before the battle of Zama. The interval between this point and that chosen by Gibbon for the opening of his history, a period which embraces the entire career of Rome as mistress of the world, is yet open, and offers unquestionably the noblest unappropriated field for historical composition. But one shudders to think of the almost impossible combination of powers which the successful execution of such a task must require. Nor is it likely soon to be accomplished, for a great work of this kind is not usually undertaken all at once. It is first dissected, and its several portions are worked out by various hands. Then comes the master mind, to sit in judgment on their labors, reducing them to their just proportions, and moulding them into a perfect whole. But in the present case, the partial scenes and scattered biographies of this interesting period are by no means so thoroughly completed as to leave nothing for a diligent gleaner. The life of Julius Cæsar, for instance, has never been so written as to drive competition out of the field ; nor has Middleton's right to Cicero become so firmly vested as to silence every other claim. The reign of Augustus, too, forming as it does the transition stage from republicanism to monarchy, is a subject which has attracted far less attention than it deserves. What its capacities are may be guessed from Wieland's beautiful essays on the character of that emperor and his friend Mæcenæ.

The imperfect and unsettled state of this portion of history imparts a high degree of interest to every contribution, however cursory or fragmentary, which it receives from respectable writers. But when those whose living voice was an oracle speak to us as from the grave, we catch with reverent curiosity these last memorials of departed wisdom. No man can have studied the writings of Niebuhr without being profoundly impressed with his amazing knowledge and his more amazing use of it. By his side, the herd of philologists, antiquaries, and compilers, great as they may have been in their generation, dwindle into dwarfs. The whole firmament of history lies open before him, and he awes the reader by the wonder-

ful ease with which he draws from its recesses the scattered rays which had eluded less observant eyes, and collects them into obscure but yet distinguishable points. In the too much neglected constitutions of the early Swiss republics, for instance, he finds the best illustration of the relations subsisting between Rome and her municipalities and colonies ; and attributes the removal of his doubts respecting the agrarian laws to a study of the ryot tenure in Hindostan. We lay ourselves open, we are aware, to the charge of idolatry, when we say that he seems to us to have possessed the greatest intellect which has been applied to history in modern times. But we doubt if any one, after studying his works, — for they must be studied, and not merely read, — will venture to place any other name in competition with his. Whatever comes from such a man, however casual and hasty, must bear the stamp of his mind, and be valuable. Dr. Schmitz, therefore, deserves our gratitude for the great pains he has taken to reproduce, from his own notes and those of his fellow-students, the Lectures on Roman history delivered by Niebuhr at the University of Bonn. The introductory course, in particular, on the historians of Rome, is inestimable, as containing his deliberate opinions on a subject of which no man was a more competent judge.

But it is not our purpose to enter on a discussion of the merits of these Lectures. We confine ourselves to a few remarks on the manner in which the editor has discharged his office. His labor was a difficult one, for Niebuhr's oral style, though familiar and colloquial in its tone, was a series of "anacoluths"; a fault of which, as we are told, he was painfully conscious, though it was probably attributable in part to the perverse structure of the German language, which to his rapidity of thought must have been intolerable.

The style, therefore, of these volumes must belong chiefly to Dr. Schmitz ; and he seems to us to have done his work remarkably well. He has succeeded in breaking up into correct and easy English sentences the crude materials with which he had to deal. More than this, however, was incumbent on him. He was bound, so far as was possible, to free the text from those oversights and misstatements, to which, in the haste of extemporaneous delivery, every one is liable. And it was especially his duty, in no instance to make Niebuhr accountable for any of his editor's mistakes. It appears from

Dr. Schmitz's Preface, that he was fully aware of the delicacy and difficulty of his task ; and in pointing out a few errors which have fallen under our notice, some of which, we suspect, are to be placed to the editor's account, we have no desire to call in question his pious zeal or his diligent care.

At page 188, Vol. I., we are told, that, after the battle of Traşimenus, "the Romans began even to enlist *prisoners* as soldiers, when they were willing to serve." This is founded, we believe, on this passage in Livy (xxii. 11) : — "*Magna vis hominum conscripta Romæ erat ; libertini etiam, quibus liberi essent et ætas militaris, in verba juraverant.*" The *prisoners* could not have been numerous enough to make it worth while to enlist them. On the same page, we have an account of a singular mistake into which Hannibal was led by the carelessness of *one of his generals*, who conducted the army, with Hannibal in it, to Casilinum, instead of Casinum. How any other general than Hannibal could be in command of Hannibal's own army is not accounted for. The passage in Livy (xxii. 13), which Dr. Schmitz refers to as his authority, is as follows : — "*Ipse imperat duci, ut se in agrum Casinatem ducat. . . . Sed Punicum abhorrens ab Latinorum nominum prolatione, pro Casino Casilinum ut dux acciperet, fecit*"; — where *dux*, of course, means simply *the guide*, and the context shows that he spoke Latin. Hannibal had him whipped and crucified ; a punishment which he would not have inflicted on his own general for a venial mistake. Dr. Schmitz has copied both these misstatements into his own *History of Rome* ; Niebuhr, we think, could never have made either of them. At page 273, Perseus is said to have married "a daughter of *Antiochus Epiphanes*," who is accurately described in the Bible as a savage tyrant ; only Livy (xlii. 12) is cited in confirmation, where, however, it is expressly stated that it was the daughter of *Seleucus*. This may have been a slip of the memory on Niebuhr's part ; but Dr. Schmitz has indorsed it in his own history. At page 361, we read, — "Respecting the internal history of Rome during this time [an early period of the Jugurthine War] little is known, and not even the names of those who were *put to death* by the quæstors. That Opimius and Bestia fell is certain." There is, however, in Roman history, a great difference between *falling* by a judicial sentence, and being *put to death*. Opimius died in exile ; a fact for which we have the express

testimony of Cicero (*Pro Sextio*, c. 67). Dr. Schmitz, we think, should have the credit of this. In Vol. II., p. 25, it is said that the ambassadors of the Allobroges "had been drawn into the conspiracy *by Catiline*, and were initiated into the whole plan." Cicero and Sallust know nothing of this. Indeed, it is quite clear from their narratives, that the Allobroges were first tampered with by Catiline's accomplices at Rome, from whom they received letters *to* Catiline. Here, too, Dr. Schmitz has repeated the error in his own History.

Niebuhr, as every one who is familiar with his works is aware, was nearly infallible on points of genealogy, chronology, and geography. Yet at page 312, Vol. I., he is made to say that Q. Pompeius, who obtained the command in Spain in the year 613, "was one of the ancestors of Pompey the Great." This is impossible, or at least incapable of proof; for this Pompeius was a *Rufus*, and Pompey the Great was a *Strabo*. Again, at p. 355, we read that the Balearian islands were conquered by one of the *brothers* of Metellus Numidicus. Metellus Balearicus was a *cousin* of Numidicus, as Drumann's Table of the Cæcilii is sufficient to show. These inadvertencies were possible in an oral lecture; but Dr. Schmitz goes farther, and in the index to his History makes Balearicus and Numidicus one and the same person.

The editor of any of Niebuhr's works ought either to have a passable acquaintance with *modern* history, so frequent are the historian's allusions to modern times, or at least to be doubly cautious in his statements. At page 310, Vol. I., Niebuhr is made to speak thus: — "They [the Spaniards] have never fought a battle in the open field, except under the command of an Hamilcar and a Hannibal; and in modern times under a *Gonsalvo*, a *Corduba*, or an *Alba*." This reminds one of the good lady who preferred the Waverley novels to Sir Walter Scott's. Again, at p. 301, we are told, that the Achæan league "resembled the American confederacy previous to the *Constitution of Washington*, when Delaware, for instance, with its 70,000 inhabitants, was on an equality with Virginia, which had a population of *a million and a half*." Americans have nearly ceased to wonder at any depth of ignorance on the part of European writers, in reference to the history or politics of this country; but this passage is so grotesque in its errors, that it would have surprised us even in Mr. Alison.

We turn now to the History of Rome, recently prepared by Dr. Schmitz. His chief object, as we gather from his Preface, is to furnish the young student with a manual, containing the results of the most recent, as well as the older and more familiar, researches in this field of inquiry. As a pupil and admirer of Niebuhr, he adopts many of his views, and draws upon his History and Lectures for a large portion of his volume. Down to the First Punic War, he could avail himself of the three volumes of the History; and in several chapters, which we have closely compared with that work, we find marks of care and skill. His style, though rather dry for a school or college class-book, is on the whole good, and in the Introduction, in particular, is excellent. He falls, however, into occasional errors, which he might have escaped by committing his manuscript to the revision of some native Englishman. For instance, at p. 136 of the New York edition, he says, — “ This is the story of the sacking of Rome by the Gauls, and of her final *delivery* ”; a word which he uses elsewhere in the same sense. At p. 113, he says, — “ His friends had *to pay the sureties* which they had given for him.” At p. 211, he uses the expression, “ would *make* recourse to them.” In one case, (on p. 252), he makes Hannibal proceed from Fæsulæ in Etruria “ straightway *to* Rome.” Here the difference between *to* and *towards* is essential, as Hannibal found to his cost. We hope that, in another edition, these and other similar blemishes will be removed.

We could wish, too, that the proportions of Roman history had been better observed. The earlier chapters are worked out in disproportionate detail, quite as many pages being devoted to the period anterior to the Punic wars, as to the interval from the beginning of the first of those wars to the death of Julius Cæsar. In a compend of this sort, the importance of events is not in the ratio of the quantity of debate which they may have occasioned. Some points, also, of Roman antiquities are very meagrely treated. The notice of the military system of the Romans, for instance, a subject of some moment in the history of a warlike people, is wretched. Besides this, we find too few of those picturesque and characteristic traits which impart a rich coloring to the sober page of history. Anecdote and apothegm, which make up the chief part of our first lessons in history, form also the most convenient nucleus for subsequent knowledge, and should

never be overlooked by those who write for the young. We miss in the work before us the sprightliness of Michelet's sketches. Take, for example, the account, on p. 263, of Hasdrubal's expedition into Italy. The famous march of Nero to join his colleague Livius, one of the most brilliant exploits in Roman military history, and so well described by Dr. Arnold, is dismissed in three lines, and with an evident misunderstanding of the topography of the ensuing battle. But with all these and some other exceptions, this work has considerable merit, and may be used with profit in our colleges, which have long been in need of good text-books in ancient history. Its author has evidently an enlarged and elevated sense of the dignity and breadth of his subject, in which we trace the influence of Niebuhr's generous and lofty spirit.

We cannot close our notice of this volume without a word on the carelessness of which the author is too often guilty, and which seriously impairs the trustworthiness of the book. A general censure of this sort being of little value, we will point out, even at the risk of being charged with pedantry, some of the errors into which he has fallen.

Dr. Schmitz's seventeenth chapter contains the account of the Second Punic War. To the errors which we have already mentioned, in our remarks on Niebuhr's Lectures, may be added the following. On p. 249, "the valley of the Aosta" occurs twice, as if Aosta were the name of a river. After informing us, on p. 255, that the Roman army at Cannæ consisted "of 80,000 foot and upwards of 6,000 horse," he states on the next page, that "45,000 dead covered the field of battle," that "the surviving Romans capitulated," and that "Hannibal sent the Roman prisoners home to be ransomed." He has overlooked the clause in Livy (xxii. 49), "*Et tanta prope civium sociorumque pars*," which swells the number of the slain to 80,000 at least. Hannibal, instead of sending the Roman prisoners home, which would have been an act of madness, sent *ten* out of the three thousand, with a *single* Carthaginian envoy, and not with several, as Dr. Schmitz asserts. On p. 260, Marcellus, it is said, when Syracuse was taken, "did not allow the soldiers to plunder or destroy it." Livy (xxv. 31) says expressly, "*Urbs diripienda militi data est*." On p. 263, Sena is said to be "on the river Metaurus," a statement which any tolerable map, to say nothing of the recorded manœuvres of the hostile armies, will refute.

We might swell our list with instances from other parts of the volume ; but two or three will suffice. On p. 357, P. Sulpicius is said to have surrounded himself with "a body of 3000 gladiators, whom he used to call his anti-senate." Plutarch inserts "and 600 *knights*," as the antecedent of "whom"; and these, though not the gladiators, might well be called an anti-senate. On p. 359, Sylla, we are told, pardoned the famished Athenians, but plundered their city. One would hardly suppose that his victory was stained by a most cruel massacre of the inhabitants, as was really the case ; one account, perhaps exaggerated, asserts that scarcely a free person was left alive. On p. 377, Spartacus is said to have taken up his position "on Mount *Ætna*," which, of course, should be *Vesuvius*. On p. 396, *Cato* is mentioned in different paragraphs, as if only *Marcus* were meant ; whereas, in the last instance, it should be *Caius*. The conquest of Macedonia is twice stated (on p. 301 and p. 326) to have so stocked the treasury as to make the *poll-tax* unnecessary. We have looked in vain for any authority to justify such a translation of the word *tributum* in the present case. But the most slovenly piece of carelessness is to be found in the Chronological Table, in which the year of the city is inconsistent with that before Christ, in every date but two. That any one, after making 753 B. C. correspond with 1 A. U., should make 1 B. C. correspond with 752 A. U., and publish the mistake, is almost incredible.

Errors in numbers, as 15,000 for 150,000, and 8,000 for 80,000, are frequent, as well as wrong names ; — *e. g.* M. for M', Q. for P., and the like. These must be typographical ; but they might have been avoided. The two American editions have been pretty faithful in copying the typographical and other mistakes of the English copies. Of the New York edition we expected no better. But as the Andover publishers issued theirs under the sanction of a scholar, we had hoped that he would not suffer it to appear without a careful revision. Dr. Henry's edition of Taylor's Manual ought to have been the last of its kind. We do not hesitate, however, to give the preference to the Andover reprint ; for the New York edition, though superior in mechanical execution, adopts an intolerable orthography. Some of the most portentous of Dr. Webster's innovations cannot be foisted upon the reading world on the sole authority of a bookseller.